



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

WHAT NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL CONDITIONS WOULD SECURE PERMANENT PEACE?

*By John F. Downey, Dean Emeritus University of Minnesota,
and Mathematical Lecturer, University of Nanking, China*

While this is to be a paper on peace, it will present no scheme for bringing to an end the appalling war now raging in Europe. That must continue to rage either until one side is ready to yield or until both sides are so exhausted in men and resources as to be ready for the good offices of an intermediary—and may God have mercy on the millions who are falling and the millions of others, whether at the front or at home, who are suffering from the mad conflict.

Neither is this paper to present any arguments or protest against preparedness. Lest, however, I be suspected of being a “peace-at-any-price” advocate, I will state, first, that I was myself a soldier in the war for the preservation of the Union, and, second, that I am in favor of that degree of preparedness that would insure our safety against or in case of attack. I look toward the time when, by international compact, the ready military establishment of each nation shall be limited to a certain moderate maximum, to be as much below this in any case as the nation may elect; but until that time comes, history teaching us what it does, men being what we find them, and nations being what we have seen them to be, it is but sane prudence to insure in some measure our national safety.

This policy is not inconsistent with the highest aspirations for peace and the greatest abhorrence of war, and is endorsed by many active workers for the promotion of peace. Reasonable preparation for defense is not militarism, and it should be accompanied by a declaration to all the world that it is to guard against possible aggression, and not for aggression.

While under existing conditions we ought to be prepared to fight, if necessary, in self-defense, our nation should be a leader in a world movement to make wars less frequent and finally disappear altogether. They seldom settle anything so that it stays settled. How often it has happened that two nations which have fought each other have, in a short time, united to fight another nation or a group of nations, showing that the men who do the fighting, who suffer hardships, wounds, and death, are used as mere pawns by the rulers and war-lords who play the big game. What a commentary upon the folly of war is the newspaper item that "Japan is now selling Russia, for use against Germany, some big Krupp guns that Germany sold Japan for use against Russia a few years ago." Mr. Hamilton Holt, editor of *The Independent*, in his Mohonk address in May, 1915, said:

International law is no further developed today than private law was in the tenth century. Then, if two men had a dispute, they could go either to some priest or judge appointed by the king, or else go out on the field of battle and fight it out . . . The nations are in that state of civilization today where, without a qualm, they claim the right to settle their disputes in a manner which they would actually put their own subjects to death for imitating.

Modern wars, with their transportation facilities for quickly mobilizing large masses of men, with their rapid-fire rifles, machine guns, monster cannon, dreadnaughts, submarines, aircraft, submerged mines, poisonous gases, and, in many cases, an utter disregard of the laws of humanity, have become so destructive of life and property that, in a few months of madness, they fill the afflicted lands with lamentations and undo the work of many years of peace.

In our late civil war neither side had transportation facilities for the quick movement of troops; our armies fought with muzzle-loading rifles that permitted one shot in several minutes instead of many shots in one minute, as now; machine guns that mow down men in swaths had not come into use; the cannon employed were toys compared with the monster Krupps and Bethlehems of today; our navy consisted of ships that would be quite worthless now; submarines, Zeppelins, and aeroplanes were unknown; the suffocation of large masses of men by poisonous gases had not been invented and would not have been used by either side if the fiendish thing had been known; no atrocities were practised; and so sacred were the lives of women and children that if a woman or child had appeared between the fighting lines, those

lines would have ceased firing. And yet so devastating, deadly, and horrible was the work that the hero of the Atlanta Campaign and the March to the Sea said, "War is hell!"

In what terms would he define the present cataclysm in Europe, involving a dozen nations and millions of men?

What are the things that have prevented nations from uniting to secure permanent peace?

One of the great obstacles has been the tenacious clinging to the theory of national sovereignty. The theory of state sovereignty was the most serious obstacle to be overcome in forming a nation from the separate states here in North America; but it was done and not a trace of the sentiment remains. Nations have been unwilling to acknowledge responsibility to any higher authority. Each has been a law unto itself and has declined to become a unit in a sovereign world. By gradual development from the time when each man looked out for himself and by force secured what he considered his rights, we have established internal peace within towns, cities, counties, provinces, states, and the forty-six nations of the world. Any differences within them are settled by a resort to law and not to force. It is but one more step for nations to be united into a federation of the world. States cease to be sovereign and become parts of a nation by recognizing duties as well as rights; but nations have considered themselves too high and too powerful to be under law. We have Christian ethics for individuals, but pagan, worse than pagan, ethics for nations. Let us hope that at least a majority of them have now reached a stage where they recognize duties as well as rights and that the peace of the world is more important than complete national sovereignty.

A second obstacle to uniting for permanent peace has been the prevalence of the idea that, since a nation is sovereign, it must either dominate or be dominated. Hence the nations have not only spent large proportions of their substance for armaments and the maintenance of large armies and navies, but have formed alliances, so that it has become, in some cases, group against group instead of nation against nation, involving the balance of power, and

all that. Then each nation or group is in fear of other nations or groups, and, as in case of the present terrible war, a small brand is able to start a great conflagration.

A third obstacle to uniting for permanent peace has been the lack of restraint under provocation from another nation. There are always some among national assemblies, among the officers of the army and navy, among the press of the country, and among professional politicians, who flare up at any injury from another nation and begin to shout for war—and those who shout the loudest ordinarily keep farthest from the front if a war actually comes. It was this that precipitated our War of 1812 with Great Britain. President Madison tried his best to prevent it; but Clay and Calhoun and other fiery spirits in Congress forced the country into it. Before the news of our declaration of war reached England she had already, by repealing the Orders in Council, removed our chief grievance. But the fire-eaters must have war anyhow, and so war we had; but the fighting and the expense were all we got out of it. It was this that precipitated the war with Spain. President McKinley struggled hard against it. In the midst of the negotiations, when Spain was in a fair way to yield to our demands for colonial autonomy in Cuba, the *Maine* was sunk by an explosion, probably by some crank, and so many of our people were so unrestrained in their anger that war they must have, and the government cut short the negotiations and declined the proposal of the Spanish government that the cause of the destruction of the *Maine* be submitted to an international court of inquiry. Last winter, seventeen American miners on their way to reopen a mine in a robber-infested part of Mexico were robbed and murdered by Mexican bandits, and later Villa and his small band of looters made a raid across the border. After both occurrences border-state Congressmen, jingo editors, whooping head-liners, and many others, foaming with wrath, clamored for war with Mexico. Our volcanic critic of the administration, in a violent eruption, belched forth this dictum: "We should have intervened years ago. We should act, and act through the regular army."

The man to do the job is General Wood, the man who did the job in such fine shape in Cuba." It did not require much courage to say this, but it required a good deal of courage to stand against a war-mad constituency and say, There shall be no war.

I have mentioned these instances to remind you how easy it is for even a non-military, peace-loving people to begin, under provocation, to clamor for war. How much easier, then, it is for a military and less self-restrained people to go war mad.

A fourth obstacle to uniting for permanent peace has been national greed. There might be found now and then a man so selfish, so overmastered by personal greed that, if there were no higher power to prevent, he would be ready to kill his neighbor, make servants of his family, and appropriate his property; but there is a higher power and he cannot do it. In the case of nations there is, to the present time, no higher power, and how often has a nation done the exact equivalent of that, killing enough of the strong men of another nation to enable it to make subjects of the rest and appropriate the territory. And whole books have been written to justify this high-handed robbery. Bernhardt, in his *Germany and the Next War* (p. 14) says:

Strong, healthy and flourishing nations increase in numbers. From a given moment they require a continual expansion of their frontiers, they require new territory for the accommodation of their surplus population. Since almost every part of the globe is inhabited, new territory must, as a rule, be obtained at the cost of its possessors—that is to say, by conquest, which thus becomes a law of necessity.

This is a most brutal and monstrous doctrine. The man who kills his neighbor and takes his purse is a murderer and robber; but a nation that does the equivalent thing is but following the "law of necessity," according to this writer, and is justified. That is the extreme to which national greed will lead some men. When it has not been greed for power and territory, it has been greed for something else. As the creation of a power higher than that of

the nation would prevent the satisfying of this greed, strong nations have been reluctant to enter a world federation.

Before discussing the specific national and international conditions that would insure permanent peace, let us consider briefly what has already been done in the way of making wars less frequent.

I need not refer to the great change from ancient and medieval times, when it was the chief occupation of tribes, clans, and nations to fight one another, when even those of one religion fought those of another and with the sword forced conversions. We are chiefly concerned with the advances that have been made in modern times toward permanent peace.

The World Peace Foundation, with its million-dollar fund, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, with its twelve-million-dollar fund, the Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration, and the many peace societies, whether their particular schemes are workable or not, have been important factors in maintaining peace; for they have brought to the minds of the people the desirability and the possibility of the great object they sought and they have done much in the way of peace education.

In May, 1899, the representatives of twenty-six nations assembled at the Hague in a World Conference. The chief objects of the Conference had been to relieve the nations of the intolerable burdens of armaments, growing ever worse by strong competition, and to secure an agreement that any differences which nations could not settle between themselves should be settled by arbitration and not by war. Owing to the opposition of two allied nations, Germany and Austria, neither the proposition for disarmament or limitation of armaments nor the proposition for compulsory arbitration carried. The Conference, however, was not wholly in vain. A Permanent Court for the adjustment of national differences that might be referred to it was established and the thoughts not only of the representatives, but of people in all lands were turned toward means for securing permanent peace. In 1907, July to October, was held a second Hague Conference, in which

forty-four nations, all of the great powers and all but two of the small powers, participated. Owing again to the opposition of Germany and Austria there was no action regarding naval and military armaments, indeed these two allied powers objected even to the discussion of the question and arbitration was not made compulsory. As a sequel to this opposition, Germany went on with her armaments and military expansion until she reached the very acme of preparedness for war, and Austria, even after Serbia had acceded to eight out of ten demands, some of which were beyond anything that had ever before been dictated to an independent state, refused to submit to arbitration the other two, which were most fit questions for arbitration. The strong sentiment on the part of the other nations in favor of limitations of naval and military armaments and of compulsory arbitration gives great promise for the future, and the establishment of an international tribunal to which nations can submit for adjustment their differences was a great step toward making wars less frequent. Sixteen cases, some of which, in former times, would have caused a resort to arms, have been peaceably settled by this tribunal.

The great outstanding achievement in the direction of lasting peace, because it is so striking and instructive an object lesson to the world, is the peaceable settlement between Great Britain and the United States, not only of all contentions regarding the boundary line between the United States and Canada, but all other differences. At the close of the War of 1812 both nations had, for that day, large naval armaments on the Great Lakes. The question arose, Shall these be maintained and increased indefinitely or be limited and finally abolished altogether? The two nations wisely chose the latter course and, in 1817, one hundred years ago, agreed to limit the naval equipment to one vessel each on the lower lakes and two vessels each on the upper lakes, each vessel to be armed with a single eighteen-pound cannon, and gave forth the order, "All other armed vessels on these lakes shall be forthwith dismantled, and no other vessels of war shall be there built or armed." Even these were afterward withdrawn, and behold a trans-

continental boundary nearly four thousand miles long without a war vessel, or fort, or cannon, or soldier upon it, and peace along this vast stretch for a hundred years! O, yes, we have had a few cases of friction and of bristling up on both sides; but they have been settled by conferences, illustrating the truth of the statement of Secretary Elihu Root at the laying of the corner stone of the building for the Bureau of American Republics: "There are no international controversies so serious that they cannot be settled peaceably if both parties really desire peaceable settlement."

A spectacular example of the same kind occurred when the armies of Argentina and Chili, on opposite sides of the disputed border line, confronted each other and were about to begin the work of slaughter; but wiser councils prevailed and, by a conference, they settled their differences satisfactorily to both. To commemorate this event they erected, high in the Andes on the established border, a colossal statue of the Prince of Peace, with uplifted hands, in the attitude of saying, "Peace on earth, good will toward men."

What conditions in a nation will render it a reliable and effective member of a federation to maintain peace?

1. There must be a strong public opinion favoring justice between nation and nation as between man and man, and, consequently, the settling of international differences without resort to arms. No public effort, no matter how worthy and desirable the end, can be successful unless it has the support of strong public opinion. The first duty, then, of advocates for permanent peace is to educate the people to the idea of having nations subject to law as individuals are subject to law. For this education all available agencies should be employed, the home, the school, the church, the lecture platform, the press, and the various peace societies; and the educating process should be continued until the ideals of the great mass of the people are high enough to enable them to see that it is just as wrong and just as unnecessary for two nations to settle their differences by fighting each other as it is for two individuals to settle their personal differences by attacking each other with deadly weapons.

2. For a nation to be a reliable and effective member of a federation to maintain peace, its government must be democratic in principle, must be such that its ruler derives his authority from the will of the people. It is not necessary that it be a republic in form—England has her King, but is as democratic as the United States—but it is necessary that the real authority shall be in the will of the people. Immanuel Kant, in his famous essay on Perpetual Peace, published in 1795, said: “We never can have universal peace until the world is politically organized, and it will never be possible to organize the world politically until the people, not the kings, rule.” It should not be possible except to repel actual invasion, for one man or a small set of men to plunge a whole nation into war. The spread of democracy is a necessary condition for preventing wars, and the leadership of nations by an unrestricted ruler and military clique must be changed or controlled before there can be a reign of international law. The world has been tending in this direction. James Bryce, the great English statesman and author of *The American Commonwealth*, even says, “All the nations in the world, some slowly and some rapidly, but all with unrelenting feet, are coming to adopt the American form of government.” Whether they ever come fully to that or not, we know that even the most autocratic rulers are coming more and more to recognize that the will of the great mass of the people must be reckoned with.

3. For a nation to be a reliable and effective member of a federation to maintain peace, its people, the better to enable them to overcome any predatory tendencies, should fully realize that, as so ably shown by Norman Angell, trade in a nation is not strengthened by weakening trade in another nation. This requires a correction, on the part of many people, of false conceptions of the functions of the State. People speak of the trade of the United States, the trade of England, the trade of Germany, as if these governments were themselves engaged in great trade enterprises with one another. They reason that just as a steel corporation has an advantage in having its own ore-fields, so a nation has an advantage in having included within its

territory those portions of the earth that produce the things which its people need. The analogy does not hold. While two steel corporations, whether in the same country or not, are rivals and compete with each other, nations are not trade corporations at all. About the only work in which a nation resembles a commercial corporation is in the carrying of the mails. Trade is carried on by individuals, or individuals organized into companies, firms, corporations. A manufacturer's best customer may be in a country other than his own. He makes things to sell because he wants money with which to buy, and it matters not whether he sells to and buys from his own countrymen or not. Trade is a matter of exchange. A Pittsburgh firm's sharpest competitor is as likely to be in Philadelphia as in Liverpool, and its best customer is as likely to be in Liverpool as in Philadelphia. A nation is not a trade trust, competing with other nations. The merchants and the manufacturers of any country, who as individuals carry on trade, compete with one another as well as with those of other countries; and while we may have a legitimate desire that those of our own country have the greatest prosperity, we should be able to see that this is not promoted by weakening the trade in another country, to whose people we sell many of our products and from whom we buy many things that we need. It is not from the prosperous, but from the unprosperous peoples that the United States has received injury. The hordes of immigrants from unprosperous countries have lowered the wages of our own workmen and, in many localities, have lowered the whole social, moral, and intellectual standards. As between nations the motto, "Live and let live," is not wholly altruistic, but is partly selfish; for the prosperity of other nations promotes that of our own.

Having considered the conditions that must prevail in any one country in order that it may be a safe and effective member of a federation to maintain peace, let us consider the international conditions necessary to make such a federation possible.

When the millions of men now killing one another and striving hard to kill one another faster shall finally stop

fighting, and representatives of the different nations gather around a council table to talk things over, the two great things to be considered are, first, the terms for ending the present war and, second, the means of making the peace permanent. It is impossible to say at this time what conditions will be agreed upon or imposed to end the present mad and stupendous struggle, but it is quite easy to name some of the conditions necessary to perpetuate the peace.

1. To make the peace permanent it will be necessary to remove, as far as possible, the causes of war.

Some of the causes of war have already been removed and others have been diminished. For example, many of the most deplorable wars of the past have been religious wars. I think it safe to say that these are ended. While peoples prize their respective religions as highly as ever, they are not so keen in enforcing them upon others. Instead of sending the people of another religion as quickly as possible, by killing them, to hell, to which we are sure it leads them, we strive to save them from hell altogether by trying by persuasive means to convert them to our religion. Again, while wars of aggression, wars for the absorption of peoples and territory, are by no means ended, it is something that nations have become ashamed of them and use various pretexts for wars, even when this is the prime object. The shame of it, perhaps as much as the injustice of it, has greatly diminished this cause of war.

Mr. John S. Ewart, a member of the British Council, says (Mohonk Conference of 1915):

The requisite for social tranquility is that men are satisfied with, or at least that they unreservedly accept, existing conditions . . . and the same rule applies to international relations.

This is too much of a generality to have much specific value. We know that not a few men and not a few nations are dissatisfied as long as they have not grabbed everything that is grabable. The principle will have practical value for us if we put it this way: The requisite for international tranquility is that a majority of those who count

are reasonably satisfied with existing conditions, or are content to improve them without resorting to war. That a federation of nations to maintain peace may be effective, it is necessary that the nations composing it be reasonably satisfied with the conditions. When men meet, therefore, to agree upon or impose conditions for ending the present war and strive to safeguard the nations against a repetition of the awful calamity, it is most important that no nation, whether great or small, be forcibly absorbed by another when there is a strong antagonism between the peoples of those nations. A recalcitrant nation may properly be restrained from inflicting evil upon another nation, but not permanently absorbed against the will of the people. In time of peace no council could have rearranged the European territorial boundaries. No nation would have considered relinquishing what it has, no matter how foul the means by which it had been obtained. On the contrary, those that had taken most wanted more, and those that had lost most wanted it back. But at the end of the present war such a council can at least avoid extending the evil of such antagonisms. When a nation ceases to exist by being forcibly attached to another, or when a part of a nation is wrested from it, the wrong rankles in the hearts of its people and they only await their opportunity of righting or avenging the wrong.

Such a council would need to adopt regulations for the freedom of the seas, regulations for uniform port privileges for the vessels of all nations, and regulations for equal trade opportunities for all. In short, it would need to study thoroughly the causes of wars in the past, and, as far as possible, remove these causes.

2. By extending still farther among nations trade intercourse and making still greater the business interdependence we increase the incentives to the maintenance of peace.

The higher the degree of civilization the more complex becomes life and the more do people in one part of the world depend upon those in another part of the world. The extent to which the division of labor is carried, the

wide exchange of commodities, the postal service, international transportation, the annual travel of hundreds of thousands of people, the coöperation of banks of all countries, all these create a network of business ramifications that cross national boundary lines and demand international coöperation. A war between two countries or two groups of countries shuts off all this interchange between them and seriously disturbs that between other countries. The sources of many needed supplies are closed, many products cannot be marketed, and many great commercial interests and the people dependent upon them suffer. In the days when the commerce of the seas was carried in sailing ships and the commerce of the land was carried by horse-drawn or ox-drawn wagons over very bad roads and the only means of communication was by personal messenger or letter going by these same slow conveyances, interstate and intercountry commerce was very limited and there was very little in the way of division of labor. By our wonderful transportation facilities and our more wonderful facilities for communication, the capitals of the different nations are nearer to one another than were the county seats of adjoining counties a few decades ago. This has greatly increased our facilities for coöperation, has greatly extended the division of labor, has multiplied many-fold the trade between countries, and has made the people of one part of the world more dependent upon those of another part of the world. At no distant date this interdependence will become so great that nations simply cannot afford to go to war with one another; and even though rulers should have no more consideration for human life than now, the people, out of consideration for their material interests as well as for their lives, will refuse to enter into war.

3. By diminishing the number of wholly independent sovereignties the peace is rendered more secure.

Political incorporation, by the consent of the incorporated, secures internal peace. Great Britain from separate warring nations and peaceful colonies, Italy from fighting city-states, the United States from rival colonies, the German Empire from hostile kingdoms, the Entente from Eng-

land, France and Russia, the Central Powers from Germany and Austro-Hungary, all secured peace within their respective boundaries. Whenever separate nations by mutual consent have united into one nation or into an alliance, they have ceased to fight one another and have not fought other nations or alliances as frequently as they had formerly fought one another. Statistics show that "in the eleven of the most populous states of the world there are about fourteen hundred millions out of a total of seventeen hundred millions of people, and within the boundaries of each of the vast areas there is security of peace;" and while the two great European alliances are now fighting each other, there has been internal peace ever since the alliances were formed. Dr. John B. Clark, Professor of Political Economy in Columbia University, puts the case well when he says:

The prospect that peace shall ever be universal depends on its tendency to establish itself within larger and larger areas till it shall end by embracing the world. European wars have occurred in spite of alliances rather than because of them, and the general effect even of imperfect unions has been to lengthen the intervals of peace. It is an even century since a war akin to this one was waging in Europe and it is forty-four years since a war between any two great nations has taken place on that continent. The consolidating tendency in itself makes for peace.

Hence the effort should be to make larger and larger the political units and fewer and fewer the number of unfederated powers.

4. To make the peace permanent it will be necessary at the close of this war for the nations or a strong majority of the nations to agree upon definite means of preventing war.

A number of plans have been evolving in this and other countries. No one can say beforehand just what plan would be acceptable to a strong majority of a council of nations. Doubtless several of these plans have features of practical value. It is a great thing that societies and leagues have been formed, that they have presented definite plans for maintaining peace between nations and are promulgating the doctrine of permanent peace.

Of all the plans proposed that of the League to Enforce Peace, organized in June, 1915, in old Independence Hall in Philadelphia and of which ex-President Taft is President, perhaps presents the most practical features. The provisions are, briefly, the following:

1. All justiciable questions not settled by negotiations or treaties to be submitted to a judicial tribunal for judgment.
2. All other questions not settled by negotiations to be submitted to a council of conciliation for recommendation.
3. If any nation goes to war or commits acts of hostility against another before first submitting its claim or grievance as provided, all the other nations to use their economic and military forces against that nation.
4. Conferences between powers to be held from time to time to formulate and codify rules of international law.

This scheme is proposed, not by a lot of impractical, visionary idealists, but by such practical men of affairs as ex-President Taft, Secretary of State Lansing, ex-Secretary of State and ex-Senator Root, John Bassett Moore, Professor of International Law and Diplomacy in Columbia University, A. Lawrence Lowell, President of Harvard University, Edward A. Filene and John Wanamaker, merchant princes, Jacob H. Schiff, Oscar S. Strauss, Charles W. Fairbanks, and a host of others, and is endorsed by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, a great body of business men composed of 282 commercial organizations, and by the International Peace Congress held in San Francisco in October, 1915. Mr. Taft is justified in saying, "A plan that can command hearty support from two groups separated as widely as the International Peace Congress and the Chamber of Commerce of the United States must be a plan of unusual breadth and of strong, sane appeal." The New York Peace Society, by a nearly unanimous referendum vote, has endorsed the plan, as have many other peace societies and peace foundations. The American Society of International Law, of which Elihu Root is president, also supports the main proposals of the league. All this leads Mr. Taft, its president, to say further:

The support which is coming to the league from so many directions, and especially that which the business men of the country are giving, confirms its supporters in their confidence that its platform will exert a large influence in the reorganization of the world which men are going to insist shall take place at the end of the European war.

Can the national and international conditions for securing permanent peace, which I have named, be fulfilled? If not, then we must admit that while, in other respects, man has emerged from barbarism, has attained to a high degree of intelligence, has overcome and appropriated to his uses the forces of nature, has through medicine and surgery and nursing relieved distress and prolonged life, has erected in all lands hospitals for the sick and homes for the unfortunate, has even felt a kinship to the Divine One and hoped for a future life with Him, yet the men of different nations cannot quell within them the savage desire, on occasions, to fly at one another's throats and kill and devastate. More than this: Before an audience in Washington City, Frederick Douglass, that apostle of the negro race, was deploring the condition of his enslaved people and, in despair over the failure of all efforts to change it, expressed the fear that there was no ground for hope for anything better. Then arose in the audience, to her full, gaunt height, Sojourner Truth, that old negro slave woman whose crude eloquence had kindled in many hearts sympathy for her race, and shaking her long, black forefinger at the speaker, asked in a voice trembling with emotion and earnestness, "Frederick, is God dead?" If you despair of the elimination of the curse of war, I ask, is God dead? or, living, is He powerless to bring nations out of barbarism as He has brought individuals out? Is the Devil triumphant and must this hellish thing continue? Surely that self-restraint which prevents two men with a disagreement from attacking each other with deadly weapons will finally be exercised by nations, and surely He who is the God of nations as well as of individuals will finally make good the proclamation of the heralding angels, "Peace on earth, good will toward men!"